


~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

12 January 1956

MEMORANDUM FOR:



25X1A9a

George Carey

SUBJECT : Requirements

1. I am setting forth below the pattern of investigation which was evolved in our meeting of Wednesday, January 11, as I promised. Inasmuch as Mr. Carey and [REDACTED] will also be interested (though absent from the meeting), I am sending a copy to them. 25X1A9a

2. It would be my suggestion that each recipient weigh this plan of investigation with regard to:

A. Whether it would produce the evidence which is required to provide sound conclusions with regard to the assignment which the Director and the IAC levied upon Mr. Bissell and the other agencies' representatives, and,

B. Whether the plan is practical in implementation (this includes not only the matter of man-hours which under each administrator must be devoted to producing the materials required by the plan but also what I would call "political feasibility", i.e., whether the other agencies are likely to agree to this, even under such pressure as the DCI could be persuaded to exert.

Each of you is invited to amend the questions of this plan and add or subtract as he sees fit or, if he finds himself in disagreement, search his soul to see whether there is another plan that he thinks would be effective. It is my suggestion that each bring his own list to another meeting which is tentatively scheduled for the early part of next week, confirmation and an exact time will be made by phone.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

3. The plan:

The IAC agencies would be requested to provide answers to the following:

(1) What specifically are the research programs which each research office in the IAC has devised in response to the PNIO's?

(2) List the requirements which have actually been developed to implement that research program.

(3) Indicate in each case with whom (that is, what other office or agency) these requirements have been coordinated.

(4) Indicate in each case the collector on whom the requirement has been levied and accepted or rejected; indicate also whether or not each requirement was identified to the collector as being related to PNIO's.

(5) Indicate what response was received to the requirements.

Upon receipt of the foregoing information, the requirements received from research offices would then be arranged in accordance with the name of the collector identified. Thus, all of those who went to the FI would be listed together and so on. These would be sent to each collector in a list with the following questions:

(1) Which of the attached requirements were identified as related to PNIO's when you received them?

(2) Which of the requirements in the list were sufficiently specific to enable you to take collection action?

(3) Was collection action within your existing capability? If it was within your collection responsibility but not capability, what did you do about it?

(4) Did you consult with or call upon other collectors to assist with collection?


(5) Did you identify to the field representatives the relationship between these requirements and the PNIO's?

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

(6) What field response did you receive in regard to each requirement?

(7) What factors limited the completeness of your collection response to the requirements?



25X1A9a

**Office of the Director
Planning and Coordination Staff**

PCS/DCI: [redacted]:gjs 25X1A9a

Distribution:

O & 7 - As addressed

1 - PCS

✓ 1 - PCS Chrono

CONFIDENTIAL